



HILLTOP  
PHASE II COMMUNITY PLAN MEETING  
MAY 12<sup>TH</sup>, 2005  
MEETING NOTES

*These meeting notes are not a transcript or verbatim record of the dialogue that occurred at the community meeting. These notes are intended to capture, to the best of our ability, a summary of the discussion that occurred during the Open Discussion portion of the meeting, including comments and questions from the public and responses from County staff (and their representatives) that were provided during the meeting.*

---

**Public Comment:** I appreciate the language; however I believe that the language regarding ‘rural mountain character’ needs to be stronger to ensure that it is protected, in spite of this being a policy document.

*County Response:* We recognize that development will occur, the purpose of the plan is to direct that development to ensure that the character is protected. It provides policy makers with a vision of what the community wants to be. The community needs to be diligent about reminding policy makers of the provisions of the plan

**Public Comment:** I have a 5 acre property zoned as CN, it is used as a staging area for Caltrans and during the fires. It should be re-designated as CG.

*County Response:* The process is to approach County and file a General Plan amendment. The County encourages a GPA to be filed concurrently with a development application so the final design and use of the project will be known. It might be more intensive but it would also have to be consistent with the community character.

**Public Question:** Can it be done with this General Plan since it was down-zoned in the past?

*County Response:* In recognition that there was a deliberate process in the past when it was down-zoned we really need to research the

issue further before we are able to respond definitely on that issue.

**Public Question:**

I understand that there are no hard and fast rules, but will we have a chance to review the development code changes to ensure they are consistent with these policies? Regarding LU 1.2, this policy is looking at projects on a project/subdivision basis, not at the current build-out. If the current land use plan were to be built-out would we have the capacity? Can a policy be included that identifies the capacity stopping point?

*County Response:*

The objective of the policy is to basically use the Land Use Policy Map to determine the capacity.

*County Response:*

If you look at the 2030 projection and compare it to the maximum potential build-out, it shows that it will only be at 30% of build-out. If you start talking about build-out it really is about 100 years out which is well beyond the life of this plan.

**Public Question:**

Can you build on lots less than 8,000 square feet.

*County Response:*

Yes, you can build on legal lots of record but once you take into account lot coverage, setbacks, etc. what you can actually build is very limited.

**Public Comment:**

I'm uncomfortable with the number of times the word 'development' is used. Until we address carrying capacity, we shouldn't even be talking about development.

**Public Comment:**

Especially during the holiday weekends. The infrastructure and roads get maxed-out.

*County Response:*

The facts don't support that. This is a resort community and you need to look at the needs of both residents and visitors and both must make a certain amount of adjustments.

**Public Comment:**

But during the winter, the highway was shut and it could happen again, which means horrific traffic jams.

*County Response:*

That is a valid point but over the long-term it is an anomaly, this winter was highly unusual and it is difficult to plan around unpredictable conditions. We need to take it

into account for safety and evacuation purposes but we cannot plan community needs around this type of event.

**Public Comment:**

The data contradicts that, the LOS on State Routes are D and E.

*County Response:*

The County standards apply to County roads, not state highways. When a project is proposed the traffic situation is evaluated.

**Public Comment:**

A lot of people don't understand that 4 lanes are planned for SR-330. The same people who complain about traffic don't want the expansion.

**Public Comment:**

What the plan lacks is an integrated mountain plans (Lake Arrowhead, Hilltop, Crest Forest) where there is an interdependency on infrastructure.

*County Response:*

We recognize that the mountain communities are interrelated. But it is also important to point out that the County does not have jurisdiction over State Highways.

**Public Comment:**

But the county needs to recognize the State's plans for these roads and consider the impacts of growth within the County's areas on those State Highways.

*County Response:*

Impacts on surrounding areas including State Highways are assessed with EIR's for major projects.

**Public Comment:**

But that becomes burdensome on the public, it makes more sense to have it in the policy document.

**Public Comment:**

Will the Housing Element be added?

*County Response:*

No. It will be uniformly addressed for the mountains in the countywide General Plan.

**Public Comment:**

With the Skyforest Water Project (past project) I thought there would be a policy regarding limiting extraction of groundwater.

*County Response:*

We will be incorporating that into the countywide plan for the mountain region, as it is a pervasive issue within the region.

**Public Question:**

Is there a timeline for the mountain region plan?

<i>County Response:</i>	Not really we are working on the countywide policies and then will reconcile them with the community plans to find those middle tier policies that are common to the region.
<b>Public Question:</b>	Will that be presented in a public meeting like this?
<i>County Response:</i>	Not like the community plan meetings but you will be able to see drafts during the GPAC meetings, the EIR process and subsequent public hearings.
<b>Public Question</b>	If there is going to be a mountain plan or sub-regional plans this is the first time we have heard of it?
<i>County Response:</i>	That is not true we have been talking about it for a while, it was somewhat modeled after the current plan which provides regional policies. It is not a separate plan it will be part of the General Plan and will simply identify policies that are common to the regional areas.
<b>Public Comment:</b>	The mountain region plan is of equal importance to us. We need some sort of public involvement.
<i>County Response:</i>	The scope sets out a process that includes it as part of the countywide General Plan. It will be publicly available with the General Plan but will not be comparable to the program set out for the Community Plans.
<b>Public Question:</b>	‘Wildlife Corridors’ are not in the Community Plan, will it be in the countywide or regional plan? Also, the last plan used words like ‘enhance’ and ‘protect’, it is important to maintain such language.
<i>County Response:</i>	We will look into the Wildlife corridors issue and the language.
<b>Public Question:</b>	How is commercial ‘limited’?
<i>County Response:</i>	Commercial needs to be compatible with the community character. More specifically, it is mostly local serving which is necessary for the population that is here in Hilltop. Although an interest was expressed in improving commercial services for tourists, maintenance of the community character is of the utmost importance.
<b>Forest Service Comment:</b>	Since 77% of the plan area is National Forest, we need to look at how the plan goals fit with the National Forest goals and policies. Regarding open space, I suggest a policy to

‘work with the USFS to adopt a program to preserve forest health’.

*County Response:*

We welcome precise language and will take it into consideration. We have addressed that in the Safety policy, to study forest health and recognize the need to plan for the health and management of the forest. Please review and see if the policies set forth in the OS section conflict with USFS policies.

**Public Question:**

What about the shooting range in the National Forest?

*Forest Service Response:*

We appreciate input, we are aware of your concerns.

**Public Comment:**

In Lake Arrowhead we have not been shy about giving input regarding forest service within the community plan rather than just waiting for the forest service to come around

**Public Comment:**

Regarding Open Space, I would like to see something regarding enforcement, particularly of OHV's and the County's responsibility in enforcing their use.

*County Response:*

That is a coordination issue that we are working out with the USFS but we understand your point and will look at re wording it. We did hear that as an issue last time we were here and that is why we included a policy that is intended to better manage OHV use.

**Public Comment:**

But they are using public/county roads.

*County Response:*

We recognize there needs to be enforcement in combination with management.

**Public Comment:**

I would like to see work done with USFS to eliminate OHV use in the National Forest.

*Forest Service Response:*

We will be limiting OHV use outside of designated areas. We are going go through a route designation process.

**Public Comment:**

The area started out as a second home community but now it is more of a full-time community. There is a problem with the language ‘where adequate’. We want language regarding natural hazards as part of the character of the area. Our infrastructure is deteriorating. Need criteria for what is ‘adequate’ from the community. We could put

together an argument that we do not have adequate infrastructure. I suggest a bi-annual survey regarding adequacy.

*County Response:*

The project review process allows for comments regarding 'adequacy'.

**Public Comment:**

Individual projects should be evaluated on a cumulative basis.

*County Response:*

The EIR for the General Plan will evaluate cumulative impacts.

**Public Comment:**

There is the perception that this area is an extension of suburbia, people who recently moved here from more urban areas are unaware of the hazards.

*County Response:*

I think we recognize that growth is going to occur, the plan was developed in recognition that growth would occur and the document attempts to direct growth to ensure that the character and environment is preserved.